DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 138 SP 031 096

TITLE	Kansas State Inservice Plan.
INSTITUTION	Kansas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
PUB DATE	88
NOTE	55p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT	KASCO Record; v6 n2 Win 1988
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Role; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Peer Teaching; *Program Effectiveness; Staff Development; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Kansas State Inservice Plan

ABSTRACT

The first paper (by Jim Jarrett) in this monograph on the Kansas State Inservice Plan offers an overview of one facet of staff development plans, i.e., peer coaching and its effectiveness in teacher inservice education. The next paper (by Dan Neuenswander) reviews the Kansas State Department of Education Inservice Plan, defining inservice and/or staff development and setting the context within which the terms will be used. It also identifies critical elements required of an effective inservice plan and examines the state plan in the light of these elements. A counterpoint paper (by Walt Mickler) points out flaws in the plan, identifying problems and their sources, and recommending changes in the plan and its supporting policy. A bibliography lists sources of information about state programs. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED309138

Record

Kansas State Inservice Plan

KANSAS KSIP

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP031 096

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. A. Foyle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

K A S C D Executive Board
1 9 8 7 - 1 9 8 8

President

Kaye Tague, Dir. of Elementary Instruction
U.S.D. #253, Emporia
P.O. Box 1008
Emporia, KS 66801 (316) 342-4455

President-Elect

Dr. Gary Livingston, Executive Assistant Superintendent
U.S.D. #501, Topeka
624 S.W. 24th
Topeka, KS 66611 (913) 233-0313

Secretary-Treasurer

Dr. Nancy Hale, Assistant Superintendent
U.S.D. #290, Ottawa
420 South Main
Ottawa, KS 66067 (913) 242-3750

Past President

Dr. Helen Hooper, Principal
Coronado Elementary School
518 Neal
Salina, KS 67401 (913) 827-9520

Elementary Representative

Beth Koehn, Principal
McKinley Elementary School
700 West 7th
Liberal, KS 67901

Secondary Representative

Dan Lumley, Dir. of Secondary Instruction
U.S.D. #253, Emporia
P.O. Box 1008
Emporia, KS 66801 (316) 342-4455

Higher Education

Dr. Michael Kasnic, Dir. Butcher Children's School
Emporia State University
1200 Commercial Street
Emporia, KS 66801 (316) 343-1200

Representative of ASCD

Dr. Jim Jarrett, Dir. of Secondary Education
U.S.D. #500, Kansas City
625 Minnesota Avenue
Kansas City, KS 66101 (913) 621-3073

Proportional Representative to ASCD

Dr. Tom Hawk, Dir. of Secondary Curriculum
U.S.D. 383, Manhattan
2031 Poyntz
Manhattan, KS 66502 (913) 537-2400

Ex Officio Members

John Keith
U.S.D. #313, Buhler
122 North Main
Buhler, KS 67522 (316) 543-6870

KASCD Executive Secretary
Dr. Gerald Bailey
College of Education
Bluemont Hall
Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS 66506 (913) 532-5541

USA Liaison
Gerald Henderson, Executive Director
United School Administrators
820 Quincy Suite 200
Topeka, KS 66605 (913) 232-6566

KNEA Representative
Shelley Hoyle
221 West Spruce
Junction City, KS 66441

KSDE Representative
Dr. Thomas Walsh, Dir. of Educational Assistance
KS Department of Education
120 East 10th Street
Topeka, KS 66612 (913) 296-2303

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Communications Board..... 1

President's Message.....Kaye Tague..... 2

Editor's Comments.....Harvey Foyle..... 2

Contributors..... 3

OVERVIEW.....Jim Jarrett..... 4
Staff Development and Peer Coaching

POINT The State Inservice Plan:.....Dan Neuenswander..... 9
An Opportunity for School
Improvement

COUNTERPOINT The State Inservice Plan...Walt Mickler..... 16
An Impediment to School
Improvement and Effective
Public School Staff Development

Dan's Response.....Dan Neuenswander..... 29
to Walt's Position Against
the State Inservice Plan

Walt's Response.....Walt Mickler..... 33
to Dan's Position For
the State Inservice Plan

State Programs for Teacher Staff Development..... 39

Bibliography of Staff Development Resources..... 46

This book
designed and printed
by Graphic Arts Students

COMMUNICATIONS BOARD

Harvey Foyle, Chairperson & Editor
College of Education
Emporia State University
1200 Commercial Street
Emporia, KS 66801
(316) 343-1200

John Keiter
U.S.D. #253, Emporia
Box 1008
Emporia, KS 66801

Mary Paul
2650 Oxbow
Great Bend, KS 67530

Richard Lipka
College of Education
Pittsburg State University
Pittsburg, KS 66762

Aubury Schultz
Box 7
Mullinville, KS 67109

Mary McElroy
Goddard Intermediate
231 North Walnut
Goddard, KS 67052

Scott Waters
Emporia State University
1200 Commercial Street
Emporia, KS 66801

Lois Merriman
2031 Poyntz
Manhattan, KS 66502

John Wilson
College of Education
Wichita State University
Box 28
Wichita, KS 67208

Walt Mickler
2408 Jefferson
Great Bend, KS 67530

Dan Yunk
Northview Elementary School
Northview & Griffith
Manhattan, KS 66502

The KASCD Record publishes articles and newsworthy items related to the broad area of curriculum and supervision. Points of view or opinions expressed in the Record do not necessarily reflect viewpoints or opinions of the KASCD membership or editor.

All submissions should conform to the editorial guidelines of the Record. For a copy of the guidelines, contact the editor. All submissions will be edited to meet the needs of the journal.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Kaye Tague

In our continuing efforts to keep the KASCD membership informed on current educational issues, an annual thematic journal is to be published. This new service from the Communications Board will allow you to receive an in-depth study on one topic each year.

After reading this issue, contact a KASCD Executive Board member and express your ideas. We are anxious to meet your educational needs. Help us decide what those needs are and how they can be met.

A special thank you to Jim Jarrett, Dan Neuenswander, and Walt Mickler. KASCD is fortunate to have such knowledgeable members and contributors.

EDITOR'S COMMENTS

Harvey Foyle

This is an example of our new thematic winter issue. These journals will be color coded each calendar year. The fall and spring issues are one color with the thematic winter issue being a red shade so that it stands out by itself. Special thanks to Jim, Dan, and Walt for their contributions to this issue. Support is given by Dean Jack Skillett, Chair Gene Werner, and Data Processing Center Director Geri Krier at Emporia State University. The printing and graphic layout is done by John Koonce and his Flint Hills Area Vocational-Technical School students. Our journal is a cooperative effort of several institutions and many persons. Keep up the good work!!!

CONTRIBUTORS

Jim Jarrett is Director of Secondary Education in the Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools. He has been in Kansas City since 1970. His educational back- includes: B.S. from The University of Kansas (1963), M.A. from The University of Missouri-Kansas City (1970). Jim is on the Board of Directors of both KASCD and ASCD. Jim is a past president of of KASCD (1979-80). He was cited as the Outstanding Kansas Curriculum Leader for 1984-85 by KASCD.

Dr. Dan Neuenswander is Lawrence USD #497 superintendent of schools. He has been at Lawrence (KS) since 1984. His educational background includes: B.S from John Brown University (1960), M.S. from Pittsburg State (1964), Ed.D. from the University of Kansas (1972). Belonging to many administrators' organizations, he is also a member of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

Walt Mickler is assistant superintendent for curriculum in the Great Bend Public Schools. Walt is one of Kansas' leading practitioners of staff development and school improvement. He established one of the earlier multidistrict staff development programs in Kansas. His professional service has included acting as a consultant, serving on state and national staff development task forces, and writing over 30 articles and reports.

Overview

STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND PEER COACHING

KASCD PRESENTATION
January 29, 1987

Jim Jarrett

I want you to think for a couple of minutes about the staff development programs you are providing for your staff - whether at the building level or at the district level. Now think back over the past five years. How many of you are offering more inservice opportunities to your staff now than you did five years ago? As an example, over the past five years our district has quadrupled its staff development programming.

Why are so many school districts around the country increasing their inservice programming? I feel it's because staff development is listed by most people as a key to improving our schools. In 1981 ASCD published a yearbook on staff development identifying staff development as a compelling issue in education. In 1983 the Commission on Excellence proposed an eleven-month contract for teachers to allow time for professional development. Many districts who had high turnover rates but now see fewer teachers leaving their schools have come to the realization that they need to train what they have to make them better teachers. The message is coming about loud and clear - the most effective way to improve our schools is to train and retrain our teachers in instructional skills.

My experience has been that teachers are responding very positively to the recent staff development efforts that focus on specific needs of the classroom and the district. A confirmation of this has been the overwhelming support of the Kansas Inservice Plan. Although there have been some questions regarding the mechanics of the program, the overall concept of the program has been praised by teachers and administrators alike.

With the considerable sums of money that we are spending on staff development the issue becomes - how do we maximize the effects of training teachers. It appears to me that the critical issue is how do we better assure ourselves that the workshop training is transferred to the classroom as demonstrated by changed teacher behaviors. That is, did the training cause fundamental changes in practices?

For clarification I would like to distinguish between inservice and staff development. Although these two terms are often used interchangeably, I wish to make a distinction between the two for the purposes of this presentation. I am defining inservice as a program which provides awareness activities about a particular topic for the participants. Staff development provides training in specific skills which hopefully will result in changed behaviors of all participants. Awareness activities are usually part of the introductory phase of a staff development program.

Several recent studies dealing with training effectiveness as it relates to the transfer of new skills presented in workshops to actual implementation of these skills in the classroom revealed some interesting findings. In workshops which provided training through the lecture method, only about 15% of the participants later used the training in their classrooms. In those workshops which added demonstrations or modeling with the lecture, the percent of workshop participants who used the training in their classroom grew to 30%. When feedback was added along with guided practice, the transfer to the classroom rose to 50%. But when shared analysis of the feedback was added to all of the aforementioned strategies, the transfer increased to 95%. This last mentioned strategy of shared analysis is most commonly called coaching. I feel that to not include coaching as an integral part of our staff development training strategy is to greatly reduce the effectiveness of our efforts.

Coaches can be anyone - supervisors, principals, or fellow teachers - who is competent in using the teaching strategy which is being coached. However, I feel that fellow teachers - peer coaches - make the best coaches. A more conducive climate for change can be developed when two teachers are working together. It is very difficult to remove the aura of evaluation when a principal or a supervisor is involved in the process. A climate of experimentation and risk taking is most conducive to the refinement of new skills. When one is learning a new skill there is usually a period of awkwardness and uncomfortableness which is best shared by someone else who is taking the same risks and is having the same problems in refining the skill. Teachers need a comfortable, non-threatening situation in which to practice and experiment with new skills.

We need to remind ourselves that coaching is only a process by which some content can be taught. Whether it be Madeline Hunter's

effective teaching strategies, Canter's Assertive Discipline, or the various critical thinking strategies, all are forms of a particular content. Coaching has to be centered around something people want to learn.

One other important point to remember about the proper use of peer coaching is that coaches need to be trained how to coach. Some trainers who have seen the value of peer coaching have added this component as a follow-up to the presentation of the workshop content. However, even if the potential coach is proficient in the content material of the workshop, we are not assured that he has the skills necessary to be a good coach. It is essential that coaches be taught how to observe and provide adequate feedback information and how to properly conference with a fellow teacher. Without specific training in these coaching skills, we will be limiting the possible success of this follow-up strategy. Many trainers are now including "coaches' training" at the same time teachers are receiving the initial training in the new teaching strategies.

Another important aspect of peer coaching is that it opens the closed door of the classroom and provides professional companionship which is sorely missing for teachers and needed for growth. Some people have described teaching as the "loneliest profession". Teachers are confined to a classroom with a room full of students. Seldom does another adult see them teach or know what they are doing in that classroom. This is not an ideal setting to foster professional growth for any individual. In a 1980 survey teachers overwhelmingly asked for more time to talk with colleagues concerning their teaching. Seventy percent of the teachers interviewed by John Goodlad indicated that they would like to observe other teachers teaching. Most of these teachers stated that they had never observed another teacher teaching. Lastly, some research completed in 1980 found that teachers tend to learn how to teach largely through consultation with other teachers. Through peer coaching two teachers can become partners in experimentation and the refinement of new skills and share in the frustrations and successes of their endeavor. Professional growth is a natural outcome of this type of environment.

In addition to providing an atmosphere which is conducive to growth, peer coaching provides a process in which a coach can relay specific information to another teacher regarding that teacher's use of relevant skills or strategies. This does not

mean that the coach judges the quality of the teaching, but reports in an objective manner the presence or absence of specific behaviors and how thoroughly they are performed. A coach saying, "That was a good job, keep it up", just doesn't "cut it". The feedback must be specific. With this data at hand the two can analyze the lesson, discussing what alternative might have been used. These conferences take on the air of collaborative problem-solving sessions. A new tack may be decided on and a new cycle of observation, feedback, and analysis will take place between the two teachers. Thus through coaching, professional teachers engage in the continuous study of teaching.

As we compare the process of peer coaching to that of the typical workshop where material is presented in a lecture method and transfer of this information is left to chance, it is not hard to understand why there is so little transfer. Classrooms are considerably different from the training sessions. To adapt the new strategies to individual situations is a difficult and time consuming process. It is most difficult when there is no support or encouragement for the teacher who is struggling with a new teaching strategy. Without support it is too easy to get discouraged and give up, especially if there is no expectation that one is to implement the new skills presented in the staff development session. That is just what we are saying when we do not provide for any follow up to staff development. Practice without feedback does not give a teacher any basis for improvement. Can you ever imagine a football player practicing, on his own, how to block and no coach providing feedback as to what he is doing right and what he needs to change to be a more effective blocker? Support is very crucial if we are to expect behavioral changes to occur and a transfer of the workshop training to the individual classroom.

For peer coaching to work, the role of the principal in facilitating coaching programs cannot be too strongly emphasized. The principal must work with the central administration so that time and resources are available for teachers to work in this collaborative effort. If time is not made available for teachers to observe and conference one another, we cannot expect coaching to occur. But with his facilitating the coaching effort, a principal is establishing a climate in his school that promotes the continuous study and improvement of teaching and this leads to an atmosphere where improvements in all areas - curriculum, classroom management, etc. - are fostered. This atmosphere may be as important as any of the changed teacher behaviors that result from

the peer coaching.

One author has described teaching as "the second most private social activity". Bruce Joyce concludes, "Coaching offers an alternative if we are to break this isolation of the classroom, gives teachers a chance to observe others so they can compare their own skills, and foster a sharing of ideas across classrooms. Coaching is perhaps the best strategy currently available for improving teaching skills."

Point

THE STATE INSERVICE PLAN: AN OPPORTUNITY FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

Dan Neuenswander

Abstract

The terms, inservice and staff development, are used interchangeably. Inservice, by whatever definition, fits under the umbrella of organizational development. Improvement and growth of individuals and the organization are goals of inservice activities. The real issue is whether or not the state review plan provides local districts with the opportunity to establish a staff development program that meets both individual and organizational needs and goals. Through the state inservice plan, an individual district can take the initiative and establish a district focus for professional growth and development.

Definition or context

In reviewing the Kansas State Department of Education Inservice Plan, I will attempt to:

1. Define inservice and/or staff development or at least set the context in which the terms will be used.
2. Identify the critical elements required of an effective inservice plan.
3. Examine the state plan in light of these critical elements to determine if it meets the criteria of an effective inservice plan.

The state Legislature defines inservice education to mean:

"...any planned learning opportunities provided to certificated personnel employed by a school district or other authorized educational agency for purposes of improving the performance of such personnel in already held or assigned positions."

Subsequently the Kansas State Department of Education defined inservice education to mean:

"...any planned learning opportunity which is engaged in by a person after entry into a given position for the purpose of improving effectiveness or upgrading skills in an area of certification."

Both the Legislature and the state department have obviously limited the definition to certificated personnel and the partial funding provided includes only certificated personnel inservice programs. For the purposes of this paper, that limitation will be adhered to even though there is evidence that inservice should include all personnel in an organization. This definition does not exempt noncertified employees from a district's inservice plan, it merely says the state won't help pay. Also, both definitions attend to the performance and skills of individual employees. Some interpret that to mean that inservice includes only those programs which speak to individual needs as identified by the staff needs assessment. However, there is nothing in either definition that would even hint that the criteria for improved effectiveness or upgrading of skills cannot be related to the productivity of a particular school and/or an entire school district as determined by measurable outcomes established by the board of education priorities.

In a recent KASCD presentation, Jim Jarrett, director of secondary education, Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools, differentiates between inservice and staff development and defines the two terms as follows:

"Inservice is a program which provides awareness activities about a particular topic for the participants" while staff development provides "training in specific skills which, hopefully, will result in changed behavior of all participants."

That seems to be an unnecessary application of educational jargon and for purposes of this paper inservice and staff development will be used synonymously.

Regardless of the exact definition used for staff development it is important that the definition be placed in context with or in relationship to the total organization. Betty Dillon-Peterson in the ASCD publication "Staff Development-Organization Development" defined organizational development as:

"...the process undertaken by an organization or part of an organization to define and meet changing self-improvement objectives while making it possible for the individuals in the organization to meet their personal and professional objectives."

Dillon-Peterson further defines staff development to be:

"...a process designed to foster personal and professional growth for individuals within a respectable supportive positive organizational climate having as its ultimate aim better learning for students and continuous responsible renewal for educators and schools."

In this context inservice, by whatever definition, fits under the umbrella of organizational development.

I believe that this is the proper context in which inservice or staff development should be considered. Therefore it is viewed in light of improved performance and/or upgrading of skills of individual certified staff members ensuring that the improvement of individuals assist the district in meeting organizational goals. Most organizational goals emphasize the quality of the product but at the same time recognize that establishing a climate that enhances individual growth is critical to the realization of product goals.

Critical Elements

Experience and research indicate that an effective state inservice plan which plays a significant role in the improvement and growth of an organization must include several critical elements.

1. The inservice plan must encourage broad-based participation in the development, implementation and maintenance of the program.

This is absolutely necessary if staff members are expected to develop any sense of ownership for the plan. It goes without saying that it is highly predictable that any meaningful change and therefore any significant gains for the organization will be minimal at best if there is no staff ownership. Given a well-defined organizational focus, it is also reasonable to assume the greater participation in how goals will be accomplished, the greater the chances of finding effective and efficient solutions.

Finally, evidence is available which indicates that when people are included in the decision-making process, they often develop their own leadership abilities.

2. The inservice plan must include incentives or rewards which will make it worthwhile for both local districts and individual employees to participate.

3. The inservice plan must include guidelines and regulations rigorous enough to provide for accountability but flexible enough to allow for the unique needs of individuals and districts.

4. The inservice plan must provide the opportunity to establish a balance between meeting organizational goals and individual needs.

State Plan

The state plan will be reviewed first in light of the critical elements and then as it relates to the definition of inservice in the context of organizational development.

1. The state inservice plan requires local districts to establish a professional development council which is a representative group of certified personnel from the local district. This council advises the governing body. The state plan requires an assessment of needs at the local level which involves all certified personnel.

The professional development council has the responsibility to develop a district plan, including operational procedures, which is to be reviewed and approved by the board. The state plan even requires board of education and administrative involvement in the development of individual development plans. All of this surely is meant to ensure broad-based participation.

2. The incentives or rewards for both the local school district and the individual employees are obvious. Whether they are sufficient to make the extra effort worthwhile also should be obvious by the rapid increase in the number of participating districts and the escalating percentage of teachers in many districts who are writing and maintaining individual development plans (IDP).

The extrinsic incentive for local districts is in cold cash, albeit not as most participants would like to see. The extrinsic incentive or payoff for certified personnel is being allowed to use inservice points for recertification and, in some districts, being allowed to use inservice points to move horizontally on the salary schedule.

Intrinsically, both the district and the individual employee must be gratified to see the positive impact of a well-developed inservice plan on both the organizational and individual goals.

3. The state plan requires the district to have a system of checks and balances which can ensure accountability and allow for individual needs. I say can ensure because it is not possible to absolutely ensure. Many times guidelines and regulations are initially written to prevent abuse. That can be a critical error because it often renders the program too inflexible for those who want to use it in a productive and creative manner and it seldom eliminates abuse. Those who want to abuse will find a way.

The guidelines and procedures for implementation and maintenance as established by the Kansas State Board of Education can be and, in fact, have been improved. Two specific examples of improvement are:

a. Staff development activities located in surrounding states have been approved as reimbursable activities. Initially only those activities in Kansas were reimbursable.

b. In order to ease the paper work of the individual development plan, the department ruled that goals and objectives for activities would only need to be written for those activities would only need to be written for those activities which were not included in the district plan. This eliminated the repetitious writing of goals and objectives by each staff member for activities in which the district plan had previously developed goals and objectives.

Additional recommendations for improvements have been submitted by the state department staff to the state board for consideration and approval.

With the initiation of each worthwhile endeavor there is a critical point when it becomes necessary to get past the talking and

planning stage and just get started with reasonable hope of success rather than delaying action until a perfection can be ensured. Public schools are often guilty of spending so much time studying change that the initiative for change has dimmed or even died before the change is enacted. Peters and Waterman, authors of "In Search of Excellence," noted that successful companies are often marked by the ability to initiate change rapidly and company executives appear to take the philosophy of "ready, fire, aim." Kansas needed to get started on a state inservice plan. We seldom start, or even finish, with perfection. We improve as we gain experience, understanding that to amend is always an option that must be maintained.

4. The real critical question seems to be whether or not the state review plan provides local districts which the opportunity to establish a staff development program that meets both organizational and individual goals and needs.

I am convinced that the leadership of any organization can develop a productive, outcome-conscious organization and at the same time be sensitive to individual growth needs. Hopefully, many staff development activities accomplish both purposes simultaneously but any activity which addresses only one cannot be ignored on that basis alone.

An inservice plan, if it is to promote organizational development, must be written in a manner that maintains balance. The state inservice plan provides adequate checks and balances in the development of the local plan through joint participation of a professional development council, the administration and the board of education. Problems arise if the board and administration have not clearly defined the district focus or if a professional development council develops an inservice plan that is disjointed, diluted and lacks focus. Then, if individual development plans are written in a similar manner and the administration and board of education approve shoddy district and individual plans, they have no one to blame but themselves.

The authors of "Continuing to Learn, A Guidebook for Teacher Development," talk about the integration of individual goals with school and district goals:

"A good staff development program is like an umbrella: it takes into account all that is under its protection. It considers

the goals of individual teachers as well as those of the school and the district, and it works hard to integrate these into a whole."

The basic concept of the Kansas State Department of Education Inservice Plan is excellent. It is flexible enough to allow a district - which is willing to take the initiative to establish district focus - the opportunity to speak to that focus through the inservice plan and at the same time provide district personnel the opportunity to meet their individual needs.

Jarrett states that a critical question is:

"How do we better assure ourselves that the workshop training is transferred to the classroom as demonstrated by changed teacher behaviors, i.e., did the training cause fundamental changes in practices?"

I agree with Jarrett's questions but I would submit that if the answer to these questions is negative, then it is more an indictment of the local district action rather than the state inservice plan. The state inservice plan certainly is flexible enough to provide for excellent local district inservice program. It is not tight enough - nor do I believe it is possible to write a state plan that is tight enough - to ensure effective local school districts. However, if a district wants to be better its chances for success have been significantly improved.

Counterpoint

THE STATE INSERVICE PLAN: AN IMPEDIMENT TO SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AND EFFECTIVE PUBLIC SCHOOL STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Walt Mickler

Abstract

There is a critical link between effective state policy on public school staff development and productive local action for school improvement. Current state policy on staff development does tend to abort or hinder that linkage.

The current State Inservice Plan and its implementing legislation and regulations are seriously flawed, due to poor policy development actions. The flaws include:

1. failure to link staff development with school improvement based on the research and school and teacher effectiveness, instructional leadership, and school change.
2. failure to establish quality guidelines likely to result in improved local practice.
3. requiring unsound operational procedures.
4. excessive bureaucratic red tape.
5. lack of a facilitative mind set which would aid districts in creating on-line internal training and support systems at the local level (which empower local districts to undertake and maintain school and staff improvement in practice.

Those flaws must be corrected if state policy on public school staff development is to serve the important function that it should. Recommendations for change are offered.

I. PROBLEMS AND THEIR SOURCES

The State Inservice Plan, as embodied in current legislation, State Board of Education policies, and Kansas State Department of Education regulations is another example of a well-intended public policy gone awry. In its current form, it will never produce the intended results -- public school staff development programs and actions which will improve the effectiveness of school and staff in promoting the learning of students.

Why won't it produce the results? That is the focus of this position paper.

Why the state inservice plan is flawed

During the late 1970's, the State Board of Education directed the State Department of Education to come up with a draft plan to deal with the issue of public school inservice education. The Department contacted the different sectors or political constituencies in Kansas public education and asked those sectors to nominate people to serve on a task force which was to develop the plan.

The people so nominated constituted a mixed group. A few were quite knowledgeable about staff development in public education, but most were not. The Department person responsible for leading the group had little experience in public education, and a very limited background in staff development. In short, the knowledge or information base was not there for effective policy development.

Further, a number of the members of the group entered the deliberations with a greater concern about "turf protection" or pushing the desires of the interest group they represented than with validity or quality issues. Several of the university representatives were most concerned about the possible loss of credit hours. Several teacher representatives were most concerned with control and participation issues. Some administrator representatives were most interested in issues of avoiding teacher control, added paperwork, and added supervisory responsibility.

Lacking the knowledge base in staff development and the experience in policy development, the Department person responsible for leading the group failed to set a tone emphasizing validity, or to establish quality and validity parameters on the decisions of the group. Further, both that person and the chairperson of the task force were resistive to outside information and input dealing with quality and validity issues.

What happened is no surprise, given the circumstances. The task force trapped itself in unproductive "group think." (Irvin Janis defines group think as a situation in which a decision-making group (1) shows insufficient tough mindedness and excessive collegial deference, (2) lacks the information it needs to make a good decision -- and does not seek necessary data, (3) fails to consider the full range of alternatives and the pro's and con's of each, and (4) is limited in the choices it can make by the leadership of the group, or channeled by the leadership.)

So, lacking information and effective leadership, the group became embroiled in a combination of building myths into the plan and political horse-trading. Each sector extracted its price.

The group dynamics of the task force were such that administrator concerns were largely submerged.

Once their draft was completed, it was sent out to the field for responses. The leadership of the task force and Department largely ignored those inputs from the field, and guided the draft plan through the Standards Boards and State Board of Education. Once adopted by the State Board, the same Department staff gave Legislators the information it wanted them to have, and got the implementing legislation it wanted.

As a result, we have an unproductive policy. There was a time when I supported it, feeling that an imperfect State Inservice Plan promoting public school staff development was better than none. After the equally flawed implementing legislation, the experience of working with several districts to develop and implement local plans under the State Inservice Plan, and recent research findings on staff development which contradict provisions of the Plan, I have come to the conclusion that I was wrong. We urgently need to revise the State Inservice Plan.

What is wrong with the state inservice plan and the implementing legislation

The bottom line of what is wrong with the State Inservice Plan is that it will never promote the improvement in quality of public school staff development that it should. Parts of it are built on false premises, and on political compromises which insure that the Plan will never achieve its intent. Among the flaws are the following:

1. There is only one valid reason for public investment in staff development for public educators: to improve school, program, and staff effectiveness in promoting high levels of student learning by insuring that local educators have the knowledge and skills necessary to implement effective instructional practices. Anything else is extraneous. Yet, the Plan does not create that mission, or require the linking of inservice planning to that mission.

2. The Plan never comes to grips with a key issue: Is staff development or inservice education an individual decision or a district concern? The facts are these:

...The effective teacher or administrator is not a solo practitioner totally free to go his or her own way in teaching or in staff development. Rather, he or she is contributing a member of a school organization with a mission of promoting high level of student learning of desired knowledge and skills.

...As such, the teacher is not free to "do his own thing" in his or her staff development funded by the district. Rather, the purpose of such staff development is to insure that the individual has the knowledge and skill to "systematically use" the best practices in his or her job role to achieve school goals and objectives.

...If the individual wants to pursue a different job role, that is an individual choice -- not a district concern. Similarly, if the individual wants to take part in "welfare" inservice activities -- managing your money, CPR, stress management, wellness, etc. -- those are personal development choices which have nothing to do with achievement of the school mission. Therefore, no such activities should be considered part of the district's responsibility in staff development.

...The district staff development program is a district management concern -- a program designed to insure that staff have the knowledge and skills to perform effectively in the defined job roles, and to successfully implement better school practices. For a district to relinquish that responsibility to teacher control or teacher choices is grossly irresponsible. Teachers should be involved in planning in some stages, but only under the tight constraints of adherence to quality staff development principles and to school improvement plans and goals.

3. The Plan establishes required operational structure and procedures which are organizationally unsound, are built on myths directly contradictory to recent research on staff development, and which will interfere with effective staff development programs and action.

...The plan calls for a teacher dominated professional development committee, under the premise that teacher control of staff development planning and action will result in better inservice education. That is a myth.

...The plan calls for the professional development council to establish its own operational policies. There are two problems to that: Most teachers do not have the experience or training which enables them to manage meetings well: Such teacher generated procedures are likely to be unrealistic and inefficient. Second, the operational procedures of the council, as an arm of the school board delegated the authority only to recommend action or policy, should be established by the school board.

...The plan calls for teachers to plan and conduct the needs assessment, determine the district staff development goals, and plan a program of activities. The problems with this are multifold: First, the scope or focus of such needs assessment is not

limited to school improvement (and it should be). Second, teachers generally lack the knowledge and skill assessment. Third, the needs assessment process within an effective staff development program is not determined by teachers: It is designed by knowledgeable instructional leaders to determine what staff need to increase their performance in their job roles and/or to successfully implement practices designed to lead to the attainment of school improvement goals.

...The Plan calls for the teacher controlled Professional Development Council to determine the staff development goals and objectives, and to plan a program of activities. Again, there are real problems:

--The determination of those goals and objectives is a district management responsibility, and those reflect school improvement goals and plans. Anything else is extraneous.

--This requirement is built on the myth that teacher involvement in staff development planning results in greater quality. Research does not confirm this. As Bruce Joyce notes from his research: "When teachers plan their own inservice . . . they plan the same workshops and the same approaches they have complained about. . . and probably know in their hearts (that it) will not work." Guskey finds that when teachers are involved too early in the planning of staff development, they tend to compromise the integrity and effectiveness of the programs. Betty Dillon-Peterson, one of the staff development leaders in the country, notes with disillusionment that when teachers are given the freedom to plan staff development they tend to choose "neat things" and "welfare" topics that will not result in one iota of improved practice.

--When the planning of staff development activities is not focused on specific district and building level school improvement goals, staff development programs tend to deteriorate into motivational goals, staff development programs tend to deteriorate into motivational speakers, many unlinked "awareness" sessions, neat things, and welfare topics -- activities that will result in minimal impact on improved practice.

4. The State Plan establishes bureaucratic requirements which, while well intended, will interfere with effective development action at the local level:

...The Individual Development Plan System, while intended to insure that the person's staff development for recertification credit is well planned, has the general result of discouraging teachers from participating in the program:

--putting together a 5-year plan is unrealistic for most

people. Most of us have no idea of what we will be doing five years from now. Many fear locking themselves into something that may be irrelevant down-the-road. Further, we also do not know of opportunities in staff development which may arise three months from now, must less five years from now.

--Both the teachers and administrators state that the amount of bureaucratic paperwork involved is irritating.

...Districts report that the amount of paperwork required is excessive, and frequently results in a shift in focus from quality of the program to meeting the bureaucratic requirements.

5. The enabling legislation has two major flaws:

...It requires a detailed, extra fiscal accounting with a great deal of bureaucratic red tape. Other states much more wisely allocated a specific number of dollars per teacher or student, required the district to submit a plan which reflected valid principles of staff development and school improvement, and simply stated that the dollars earmarked for staff development must be spent for staff development. No extra fiscal accounting was required by those states.

...It called for the State Department of Education to do a needs assessment and stated that only those activities which were identified as high priorities would receive state funding. "That was an absurd action:"

--Needs assessment is a local process, not a state one.

--The "needs assessment" done by the Department was a terribly poor piece of work. It included topics which have absolutely no relationship to school improvement or to improvement of performance in teaching or administrative roles, and had huge gaps leaving out vital areas which the research on school effectiveness, teacher effectiveness, and instructional leadership are showing to be critical.

--To assume that a State list of staff development needs will encompass all of the possible valid school and staff improvement needs of local districts is ridiculous. What happens is that the State list comes to dominate local action, and get in the way of valid local needs and programs of action.

6. Nowhere in the State Inservice Plan is there a requirement that the local inservice plan reflect proven principles of staff development which will result in improvement of educational practice.

7. The equation of 20 clock hours of inservice activity to one college hour of credit is unjustified, and discourages many staff members from using inservice credit for recertification. When local inservice activities reflect principles of effective staff

development and have valid content which is likely to improve practice, they are of greater value than the vast majority of college classes.

8. The whole mind-set of the Department in relation to the State Inservice Plan is a controlling one, not a facilitating one. That is reflected in the imposed single set of operating procedures, the State "needs assessment", the bureaucratic shuffle of the Individual Development Plan, the recordkeeping and reporting requirements on districts. Further, communication from the Department to people in the field involved in staff development is frequently restricted to those people in staff development or Professional Development Council roles in districts which have filed a local plan under the State Plan. Department personnel appear not to be interested in the State Plan. Department personnel appear not to be interested in anything in relation to staff development except helping interested districts to meet the requirements of the State Plan.

Given those flaws in the provision and implementation of the Kansas State Inservice Plan, it is an obstacle to productive staff development designed result in improved practice and effectiveness (staff and school) by focus on research-based school improvement --and to the attempted actions of districts in that direction. As such, it must be revised or scrapped in totality.

II. RECOMMENDED CHANGES IN THE STATE INSERVICE PLAN AND SUPPORTING POLICY

In this section, general guidelines for the mind-set in state policy will be presented, followed by a point-by-point set of recommendations to deal with (1) the objections stated in the first section of this position paper, and (2) other considerations in promoting quality public school staff development. The bottom line must be policy which promotes growth in school effectiveness in fostering student learning.

Change in general mind-set and policy orientation

Unfortunately, the mind-set reflected in the State Inservice Plan does not match the information we have from research on effective schools and diffusion of change, from specialists on state policy, and on the realities in the field. This section will outline those considerations, and make recommendations on changes to reflect them. Currently, the State Inservice Plan reflects a belief that the State Department of Education can "do" staff

development and school improvement by regulation and information. It cannot!! What it can do is to help to cause and facilitate school improvement and effective staff development programs supporting that improvement at the local level:

1. State educational policy specialists Odden and Odden state: "The key to use of state policy in school improvement is for decision-makers to ask how they can help sustain effective practices in classrooms and schools -- NOT how they can get state level regulations faithfully implemented in schools."

2. Murphy, Mesa, and Hallinger state: "State departments of education must begin putting their own houses in order: shifting resources toward (helping districts improve) curriculum and instruction, reducing the emphasis on compliance (with bureaucratic regulations), and designing programs that focus on districts and schools as whole systems."

3. Odden and Odden state: "If states take the school effectiveness literature seriously, they must be prepared to see state goals reached differently in each school. . . State leaders should prepare for nonuniformity of appearance while insisting on uniform goals and standards."

4. Research on effective organizations indicates that they have "internal" training and support systems which insure that staff has the knowledge and skills needed to successfully implement and maintain quality practice. That is matched by considerable research on the diffusion of innovations that indicates that external organizations have a low success rate in promoting change, especially when the external organization has little understanding of the local system and has low credibility with those systems.

5. Research on organizations indicates that the introduction of a controlling mind-set via procedural regulations and an emphasis on compliance with those regulations via extensive bureaucratic red tape results in "goal displacement" in which the focus is shifted from the intent of the policy to meeting the requirements, aborting the intent and effectiveness of the policy.

6. Recent research clearly indicates that the only effective approach to staff development resulting in actual improvement of instructional and leadership practice is to require that such staff development be linked with focused school improvement attempts.

7. We know that small local districts, by themselves, do not have the fiscal and human resources to meet the demand for school improvement and for the kinds of staff development which will result in such improvement. Minimal state support to help those

small districts to act collaboratively to form the equivalent of area service centers would create the local resources, and the "on-line", locally "owned" and supported training and support systems. Yet, current state policy resists that idea.

8. The state cannot mandate local staff development needs via an "approvable" list of topics. That is utter nonsense! What it can do is to maintain sufficient contact with local districts to gain awareness of the kinds of improvement needs that districts are finding, to maintain contact with national resources and developments in order to know what resources are available to meet local needs, and sponsor valid training of local trainers to create on-line, locally based resources to meet the needs.

State policy in relation to public school staff development must reflect these considerations. Following are recommendations which do so.

Changes in enabling legislation

Useful legislation which incorporates the above principles should provide the following changes:

1. Require each district to develop a school improvement plan, based on an internal assessment of practice in relation to effective schools, effective instruction, and instructional leadership criteria reflected in the research on school effectiveness.

2. Require each district to develop a staff development plan to aid in meeting the defined district school improvement needs and goals.

3. Provide support for staff development on a per pupil in the district basis, with the requirement of matching district funds, with the following provisions:

a. The allocation should be at least $5.00 per pupil.

b. Districts with less than 200 professional staff members would be required to join with other districts to form an area service center to provide staff development and school improvement services.

c. In those districts which support an area service center, at least $3.00 of each $5.00 (combined state and local dollars) earmarked for staff development would be expended through the area service center:

(1) such funds would be expended for:

(a) direct training by the service center

(b) costs of training by external presenters arranged by the service center

(c) costs to a single district for using a member of its staff as a trainer for other districts served by the center

(d) honoraria for staff members of the service districts who conduct training activities off-duty hours

(e) purchase of staff development materials to be shared among districts

(f) purchase of audio-visual equipment necessary to operate the center program

(g) costs of training local staff as cadre to deliver specific training

(h) costs of staff development planning meetings

(2) General operational (administrative) costs of the service center would be borne by participation districts served by the center

4. Eliminate duplicative fiscal accounting requirements, and simply require that:

a. funds allocated for staff development be spent for that purpose and only that.

b. such expenditures be monitored through the district's normal yearly fiscal audit.

5. Require the Kansas State Department of Education to develop State Inservice Plan implementing regulations which meet these guidelines:

a. The State Inservice Plan must specify quality criteria for local staff development or inservice education plans and programs, including the following:

(1) The district staff development plan must focus on achievement of defined district school improvement goals, derived by assessment of local practices in comparison to research-based criteria of effective schools, instruction, and instructional leadership.

(2) The program of activities developed by the district under its staff development plan must reflect the principles of staff development planning and practices which are likely to result in actual improvement of practice in relation to improvement goals.

(b) The State Inservice Plan must specify that staff development is a district management function designed to result in improvement of school, program, and staff performance in producing student learning.

(c) The State Inservice Plan must eliminate the Professional Development Council requirements, and MUST NOT impose single operational procedure requirements (and related reporting requirements) on the district.

(d) The Plan must eliminate the Individual Development Plan requirements and simply require the district to set up procedures which:

(1) insure that all staff development activities approved for an individual (including college credit hours) are clearly related to the school improvement goals of the district and/or to improvement of performance in the current job role, and meet district and state quality and point criteria.

(2) still allow the individual some flexibility in kinds of approvable activities, but still require that they meet the criteria in (1), above.

(3) provide for appeal in the event that there is disagreement between the professional and his or her supervisor in relation to staff development activities which are approvable.

e. The State Plan should require that each individual employed within a district earn at least 50 percent of the credit toward recertification in the form of inservice credit.

f. The State Inservice Plan should eliminate the discrepancy in point value between university credit and local inservice credit.

6. Reduce district staff development reporting requirements to:

(a) filing a school improvement and staff development plan which meets quality standards.

(b) filing changes to (a)

(c) maintaining records of staff development activities and expenditures (to be examined in the normal yearly district audit).

(d) filing individual staff transcripts of approved completed activities with the KSDE Certification Section.

7. Eliminate the State Board policy which allows a certified professional to be recertified simply on the basis of employment.

8. Provide for the establishment of area service centers to provide staff development and school improvement services in smaller districts, under the following guidelines:

a. Such centers would be governed by the participating districts in an area service center would be expected to maintain support.

b. After start-up assistance, the participating districts in an area service center would be expected to maintain support.

c. The minimum professional population to be served by an area service center would be at least 500 staff.

d. No start-up funds would be provided for a district which manages its own staff development program independently, or for an area service center already in full operation.

e. Districts with less than 400 teachers would be encouraged to join in establishing an area service center, as opposed to operating independently in staff development.

9. Require the Kansas State Department of Education to shift its staff development focus to that of:

a. reviewing local inservice plans in related to stated criteria.

b. providing assistance to districts in developing their own capacity to plan school improvement and staff development programs.

c. maintaining contacts with single district staff development programs and service centers to determine what local need priorities are.

d. working with districts and all area service centers in the state to sponsor training activities in relation to local need priorities in such a manner as to develop on-line local training resources.

10. Remove state staff development policy review function from the State Standards Boards. Those bodies have not shown themselves to be capable of effective policy development.

11. Reverse the State Board of Education policy which allows an individual to recertify based solely on experience twice. (Given the rapidity with which data on school, teacher, and administrator effectiveness is accumulating, it is unconscionable to allow a professional educator to go ten years without keeping touch with that information.)

12. Provide funding for staff development as follows:

a. district funding as previously specified ($5.00 per pupil)

b. $20,000 per new area service center for assistance in establishing such a center (1 year only; a maximum of 15 such grants per year) limited to 25 such centers in the entire state. Existing fully operational centers and single district programs would receive no added funding.

c. $40,000 per year to the Kansas State Department of Education to (a) assist local districts in developing local capacity to plan and manage school improvement and staff development, and (b) sponsor training of local resource people in priority local needs areas (to be determined by networking between area service centers and single district staff development programs), with the Department acting as the arranger, and local districts

paying the cost of actual training.

Actual cost to the state

Staff Development Funds to Districts	$1,940,000
Area Service Center Assistance	300,000
Funds to the KSDE	40,000
Total	$2,280,000

Conclusion

Valid state staff development and school improvement policy is essential for the pursuit of excellence in Kansas public education. Such policy must (1) create an undeniable link between school improvement and staff development, (2) require local plans to address quality criteria which increase the likelihood of improvement of practice, (3) minimize bureaucratic control, and (4) seek to empower districts to develop internal training and support systems. Current policy does none of these.

Dan's Response
to Walt's Position
Against the State Inservice Plan

Dear Walt:

Walt, my friend, I can't believe you said all that! I do declare that some of your conclusions indicate that your reasoning may be "flawed!" I enjoyed reading your comments and it is obvious you are very knowledgeable about staff development but I must take exception to some of your conclusions.

As I respond to your declaration that the Kansas State Inservice Plan is an impediment to school improvement, I am tempted to debate paragraph by paragraph - that will come later - but first, several general observations.

You and I seem to have critical philosophical differences concerning what helps organizations become strong and what we believe about the inherent, native ability of professional educators.

First, it appears that you are convinced that organizational growth and improvement are maximized by what Larry Lezotte, Michigan State researcher on school effects, refers to as a "top-down, outside-in, mandate-driven" approach to change. School-effects research and current state and local experience are sufficient to at least give reason to question the validity of this approach.

Second, Walt, you seem to be convinced that teachers, left to their own initiative and ability, are not capable of developing anything of value with respect to inservice.

Those two implications point to a lack of recognition or consideration of how effectively a board of education, an administrative staff and a teaching staff can work together for the development and improvement of an organization and individuals within the organization. Walt, you seem to conclude that boards and/or administrators, in their infinite wisdom, must dictate the inservice program for the eternal profit of an ever-grateful but incompetent staff - or - the staff, incapable as they are, must be allowed to wallow in the pits of self - imposed mediocrity, reaping the harvest of poorly developed needs assessments.

But balance, Walter, balance. I believe such was not the intent of either the Legislature or the state board and I further believe the state plan adequately provides for a more reasonable, balanced and effective approach to inservice.

I do want to examine a few of your comments concerning the state inservice plan.

1. Walt, you imply that staff development equals school improvement and since the state does not mandate this, the plan is flawed. On the other hand, I believe that the local inservice plan equals local options, district goals and school improvement for Lawrence Public Schools. The state plan certainly makes this possible.

2. Attention is drawn to district decisions as opposed to individual decisions with an implication that the individual is never independent but only part of the whole; that welfare roles such as CPR, health and wellness etc. should not be part of the district staff development plan and that relinquishing the responsibility for district staff development plan is grossly irresponsible. I agree that welfare programs such as CPR, health and wellness can be argued either way. However, by giving options through IDPs, district goals can be met without fighting this battle. As far as relinquishing the responsibility for district staff development plans, I believe that it is essential that we all share the responsibility for professional growth; that that responsibility should not be that of administrators alone. District staff development programs can be initiated at any time by the superintendent, the board, or the principals in addition to, or as a part of, the district inservice plan.

3. The plan is deemed to be organizationally unsound in structure and procedure. It is implied that it is teacher-dominated, that needs assessment has no place outside of a specific school improvement plan, that teachers generally lack the knowledge to do needs assessment, that teacher involvement in planning is bad, and that when staff development is not linked to specific district goals, inservice deteriorates into welfare topics. I suggest that there is no place in either the legislation or the state plan that requires teacher domination. The professional council is comprised of administrators and teachers working together. Needs assessments can, and probably should, be linked to school improvement if the district desires school improvement.

However, let's not forget, Walt, that while we both talk about district goals - and they are important - effective schools research indicates that real change occurs through effective improvement plans at the building level with teacher and parent involvement. I would also point out that even when procedures, goals and activities are planned by the professional development council, and even if that council is teacher-dominated, the school board must also approve both the inservice plan and IDPs. Welfare topics, again, are debatable, but with a cooperative effort, a reasonable balance can be established.

4. Attention is drawn to the state-required bureaucracy, the fact that IDPs discourage participation, that five-year plans are unrealistic and the paper work is irrational. I agree that we need to carefully watch the flow of paper. We must be careful when we say "it's not bad once you get it started." The issue is still time not comfort. Becoming comfortable with an inappropriate activity doesn't make it any more appropriate. However, most professional educators will agree that it's much easier to "back off" regulations or rules which are excessively rigorous than to "tighten up" on rules that are excessively lenient - and, paper work has been streamlined. Also, the five-year plan serves only as a road map, it doesn't need to have great specificity and the five-year IDP is not mandated.

5. Walt, you referred to the "state department mindset", that of controlling. I'm sure, the "state department mindset" is in the eye of the beholder. I would guess that the state department is like any other organization, including most of our school districts, and there will be those few individuals whose primary motivation is to control. However, the vast majority, I believe, will lean toward a primary motivation of service. And it is interesting, Walt, how many times we administrators clamor for local control but want the state to "do something" when the pressure gets on. And we must remember, there is a well-conceived document somewhere which suggests that education is a function of the state.

6. I gather that you are suggesting that the state department should not suggest inservice priorities and that the teacher/administrator professional development council is not capable of suggesting priorities. Do we assume, therefore, that the board/superintendent combination has all the answers for better schools? If that is true, then why all the clamor for school

improvement because historically boards/superintendents have always had control of district resources. Having control of resources and a corner on all of the educational wisdom should have been a dynamite combination.

7. Walt, only one comment about your proposal for "enabling legislation". What happened to the need for districts to set improvement goals unique to the district? Your suggestion that every school district in the state except the larger dozen or so ("districts with less than 200 professional staff members") "be required to join with other districts to form an area service center to provide staff development" seems a tad inconsistent to me.

In short, Walt, I believe the state inservice plan provides local districts with the opportunity to become better. It is sufficiently flexible to meet the unique needs of individual districts. And, Walt, let's not nail anything down that isn't moving out of control. Let's keep our flexibility because the critical determining factor for developing inservice which really makes a difference is local leadership.

Dan

Walt's Response
to Dan's Position
For the State Inservice Plan

Dear Dan:

I believe that we are in total agreement on the importance of staff development in public education. To quote Bruce Joyce and Beverly Showers:

"The study (and application) of academic substance, teaching and school improvement should be an inescapable part of the job... Incentives are not a good substitute for the embedding of staff development support within the context of the workplace... Recent research on staff development has demonstrated that all teachers (and administrators) can learn the most powerful and complex teaching (and leadership) strategies provided that staff development is properly designed... Schools become outstanding when school improvement is prominent among their features."

Please note that I do not use the term "inservice education." It is a "boxcar concept" so full of assorted freight (feelings, connotations, and different meanings) that mere use conjures up confusion. Instead, I use "staff development", defined as follows:

"opportunities designed to lead to concrete improvements in practice at individual, program, school and district levels, resulting in increased student success in attaining learning goals of the program, school, and district. It includes informational activities to give a sense of what is possible, comparison of current practice to quality indicators, decision-making on what to change and adopt/adapt, training, and support to promote successful mastery and implementation of the changes in practice.

In that vein, I firmly believe that any person deserving of the title "educator" must be constantly involved in that kind of study and application as a part of the job role, and as a condition of employment. At the same time, staff development is a district support program designed to make all staff "winners" in achieving the school mission and goals, and enabling all staff and schools to be self-renewing. To achieve that, the district must provide the support and context for that continued study and action.

Staff development is a vital district function, not a state one. State policy should require districts to engage in staff development aimed at school improvement, and assist them in the process. We desperately need such policy. The current State Inservice Plan and accompanying regulations were a start, but a seriously flawed start which is out of touch with the reality of strong research on staff development and school improvement. As a consequence it, and its management of it by KSDE staff, are an impediment to increased student learning through locally-based staff development focusing on school improvement.

We have a number of points of agreement. Let's go over the major points of apparent disagreement about the State Inservice Plan:

1. I am fully in favor of INFORMED, broad-based participation in staff development planning and action. However, the Plan allows a PDC to set up its own operational procedures, means of needs assessment, policies, and plan of activities independent of any knowledge base on research-based principles. Without any training on those issues, the PDC can (and often does) plan junk: Look through local plans! In fact, all major figures in staff development (including Fullan, Joyce, Dillon-Peterson, Guskey, etc.) conclude that (without specific training in staff development planning resulting in improvement of practice) teacher planning of staff development is disappointingly poor. I am not about to put the planning of such a critical issue as staff development in the hands of an untrained group to muddle about with.

a. We need to be setting up on-line training and support systems within districts -- by training staff in assessing practice, problem-solving and decision-making on practice, school improvement planning, as trainers, in coaching and supporting each other. That is informed participation.

b. Dan, in working with several districts, we set up school improvement teams in each building and trained them in assessing practice, effective schools issues, and planning and managing improvement. Logically, those teams should have acted as the PDCs to insure linkage between school improvement and staff development. The Department would not allow that because they were not elected. That is absurd policy and action.

c. Dan, if you were not concerned with issues of PDC meddling, why did you maintain control over your own program of staff development for school improvement, and let the PDC go its own way with less important issues?

d. Why did the State Plan and the Department not set up a training system for training PDCs in quality staff development practices? The training done has been in how to meet regulations.

2. Dan, you and I both know that the best incentives to participation in quality staff development are (a) the expectation of participation as a condition of employment, (b) a working climate emphasizing high expectations, support, and results, (c) actual gains in practice and student learning as a consequence, and (d) strong, improvement oriented leadership at the building and district levels. The State Plan and regulations cannot provide those. Yes, credit should be granted for staff development leading to improved practice -- but not as an incentive. It simply needs to be recognized for its validity.

3. In reality, there are NO quality standards in the State Plan. A PDC can choose any kind of a needs assessment it wants. It can plan virtually any program of activities it wants, provided it meets somebody's wish list -- regardless of whether the format and content will ever produce any results in terms of improved practice and student learning outcomes. Allowing that, and allowing the inclusion of "welfare" topics (stress, planning your retirement, wellness, teacher rights, etc.) cheapens both staff development and the profession itself, and wastes public funds in very tight fiscal times. Further, there is no requirement that the activities be related directly to improvement of practice in the current job role or to school improvement goals of the building or district. A person can pursue a career shift (a personal investment) and count it, while doing nothing to improve current performance.

4. Yes, a good State Plan requires documentation from the district to insure quality. But, the only documentation that shows quality is (a) validation of needs assessment based on comparison of current practice to quality indicators, (b) plans of staff development activities reflecting proper application of quality principles likely to result in improved practice, (c) actual records of participation sent directly to the Department for their recertification record-keeping, and (d) documentation of

changes in practice and in student learning. Anything else is bureaucratic clutter promoting "goal displacement" away from intent to meeting senseless regulations.

5. The improvements you mention are minor corrections of rather senseless regulations and rulings. They still do not address the major issues.

6. A good Plan does need quality standards reflecting effective staff development leading to school improvement. Those are the only checks needed. If the local district trains staff in staff development principles, involves them in assessing practice against quality indicators and in planning programs likely to lead to real and persisting improvement, what other checks and balances are necessary?

In your position, Dan, I think you miss other key points which the policy and Department staff behavior (when compared to the research of Murphy, Mesa, and Hallinger; Odden and Odden; and the DESSI studies) indicate. All of those sources indicate the insanity of school improvement and staff development through state-level regulation and compliance monitoring; and indicate that the most effective policy is creating a demand for school improvement and staff development and the creation of an infrastructure of support to local districts. To quote Loucks and Crandall:

". . . But, it is only effective when linked to resources to deal with the problems. A pool of adoptable practices... or a concerted effort on the part of the state agency to arrange for training and support in selected practices... can be effective strategies. Their effectiveness is further enhanced by assistance to those responsible for improvement efforts in schools and districts."

The Plan and Department staff administration of it do not achieve this. In fact Department staff behavior in relation to staff development is control oriented, exclusionary, and divisive:

1. Department staff have resisted changes in thrust which would (a) enable small rural districts to collaborate for staff development and school improvement, and (b) offer availability of training resources in a turn-key fashion which would generate on-line, locally-based resources for staff development and school improvement. (In contrast, their counterparts in Nebraska have

assisted in setting up collaborative educational service units and in sponsoring training of local trainers in cooperative learning, clinical teaching, school improvement planning, TESA/GESA, learning strategies, etc., etc.) Those issues may not be of concern to you in Lawrence, but they are to most of the rest of the state.

2. Department staff have consistently refused to even communicate with staff development leaders in the state who are not formal members of a local PDC. It almost seems that they want a dependent group which they can control.

3. Department staff have deliberately tried to delay or stop the formation of a state affiliate of the National Staff Development Council, an organization most in touch with quality staff development and goal-oriented school improvement. Why?

4. Department staff statements, in their attempt to begin "networking" between those involved in staff development, make it clear that their concept of networking is (a) only between PDC members, and (b) funneling everything through that staff for them to decide what is important. (In contrast, Nebraska department staff meet with local staff development and district leaders and have those locally-based people tell the department what is important, with that Department facilitating both the shared communication and action resulting from it.)

Add to that the fact that the legal role of the Department is to aid school districts in delivering quality educational services to children. The school district is the only legal client of that agency. Yet, Department staff involved with the Inservice plan seem to think that their clients are teachers, the teachers' unions, and the dependent PDCs. Consequently, their mindset and actions in formulating and implementing the State Inservice Plan are a substantial obstacle to the most effective staff development and school improvement at the local level. And, only we at the local level can do it -- the Department cannot!

No, Dan, I cannot agree that the current Inservice Plan and its administration are a good start. Due to the controlling mindset, senseless bureaucratic regulations, lack of quality standards, and failure to build an inclusive infrastructure of support, my advice to school districts is to get out of the Plan or never join it. The inflexibility of Department staff leads me to believe that

such action is necessary to get attention.

Instead, let me give an alternative suggestion: Have the Legislature allocate $10.00 per pupil to each district each year, with the requirement that the funds be used solely to deliver quality staff development services which result in demonstrably improved practices and increased student outcomes. Put Department staff in charge of keeping recertification records so they would not get in our way. The collaboratives would begin to arise naturally, as would statewide networking -- building a field-based infrastructure of support. Then, those of us at district and collaborative levels who have the commitment, knowledge and skills to conduct quality staff development resulting in real school improvement could show the Department and other less knowledgeable districts how it can be done and what the results will be. I am not being facetious.

Walt

STATE PROGRAMS FOR TEACHER STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Information about state programs and the following bibliography was obtained from **Judith Hamilton**, Kansas State Department of Education. Ronald A Crowell, Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University developed a background paper, "State Programs for Teacher Staff Development" (August, 1986), for the Evaluation of the Educator Inservice Training Center. The following material is selected from that paper (reprinted by permission). For the full paper and its citations contact the Kansas State Department of Education or **Ronald A. Crowell, Western Michigan University**.

Section I of the paper included states which have no state level inservice program or policy: Alaska, Arizona, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania.

Section II of the paper included states which have initiated programs and/or policies which affect local districts or individual staff members, but which allocate no state funds: Arkansas, Colorado, Mississippi, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Section III of the paper included states where the legislature has mandated a staff development program, or where the state education agency has adopted policy guidelines for required staff development and state money has been allocated to support these efforts: California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, **Kansas**, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington.

Crowell's paper provided an historical framework for teacher staff development programs in its introduction. The following selection is that introduction.

In the past few years, state legislatures have become increasingly active in initiating programs for the professional development of school staffs. Through legislative action or state board of education policy, many states have developed guidelines and, in many cases, have provided financial resources for staff development for teachers and other educational personnel. This paper examines the extent of those activities in 49 states (Alabama was excluded) and, where information was made available, describes in more detail those programs which resemble teacher center-type operations.

State legislated mandates specifically directed toward staff development of teachers are of relatively recent vintage. Prior to the 1970s, state driven programs of the type described in this paper did not exist. Educators, however, have promoted the need for inservice education for teacher for a long period of time. In fact, there have been wide-spread attempts to provide inservice for teachers since the mid 1800s. Stephen Corey has observed that "inservice activities have been part and parcel of American education for more than a century" (Corey, 1957). The first teachers' institute, for example, was held in the summer of 1839 (Edelfelt and Johnson, 1980). However, the form, purpose, and emphasis of inservice teacher education has developed primarily according to the influence of various factors which also contributed to the evolution of education in this country.

In the last century and through most of the first half of this century, inservice education was driven primarily by a "deficit" model; a position which viewed inservice as needing to be directed toward the most obvious defects of teachers (Rickey, 1957). The teachers' institutes, for example, originated during a time when there was a shortage of even partially trained teachers. This shortage of prepared teachers, coupled with the steady expansion of school systems, was the principle force behind inservice education in the nineteenth century and through the first half of this century.

Another important factor was the development of certification requirements imposed by the states beginning around the time of the first world war and lasting through the 1930s. Teachers were required to meet new and changing credentialing guidelines at increasingly higher standards. Teachers met such specifications primarily by means of college courses and summer activities.

Through this entire period, however, inservice education received relatively little attention or support as a high priority policy in public education. As requirements for the bachelors degree became uniform throughout the country, inservice education moved even further from the spot-light. Harris has noted that, until recently, the approach to inservice education taken in this country has been "casual or sporadic" at best (Harris, 1980).

Changing national priorities and a changing educational contest in the mid 1970s radically altered this traditional view of teacher inservice education. Massive injections of federal money in the 60s and new pressures on schools caused by decreasing enrollments and severe economic constraints through most of the 70s caused major changes in the education work place. These factors, coupled with expanding curricular content and mandated programs, provided the impetus for considerable interest and activity in staff development by the mid 70s. The prediction was made by a leading authority in 1974 that the continuing professional development of school staffs would be the highest priority for American education in the coming decade (Edelfelt, 1974). In 1980, Harris pointed out that many conditions exist which create great urgency for inservice efforts and concluded that there was a necessity for a "major programmatic effort of the inservice education of personnel in all elementary and secondary schools and colleges" (Harris, 1980). Two years later, he reiterated that the conditions existing in education "makes inservice education development a logical top priority at local, state, and national levels" (Harris, 1982).

This renewed activity and sense of urgency in the 70s, the withdrawal of federal programmatic support, and a heightened public awareness of problems with our educational system encouraged legislatures and state education agencies to become much more actively involved in staff development efforts. Many states which never before had directly funded staff development began to develop programs and organize ways to provide support to local school districts for inservice education. In little over a decade, states entered the staff development picture in a major way.

Most of the early attempts of state agencies focused on programs designed only to bring inservice education under the aegis of the state. The aim was to design procedures to require and support staff development without interfering with other aspects of local control. One important factor that distinguishes the most recent staff development legislation from that in place five or six years

ago is the focus on the broader topic of "school improvement". In many states, recent reform legislation has taken the form of a state-wide school improvement program or a quality education act. In these states, the staff development initiative is usually subsumed under the umbrella of the larger program. Statewide school improvement programs and quality education acts are presented as more comprehensive, inclusive approaches. Such approaches often include plans and guidelines for new organizational structures, curriculum modifications and additions, staff evaluation and career ladders, and certification changes--as well as staff development. In these state initiatives, staff development is integrated with the other improvement efforts and may be tied to meeting new certification requirements and meeting the demands of an upgraded curriculum. In those states which have not passed reform legislation, state-wide staff development programs usually remain separate ventures, operating independently of other state programs.

One thing an examination of all this activity makes clear is that the state role in staff development varies considerably among the states. State level inservice policies appear to be reflective of the current educational climate in each state. Some states have not state policy for staff development. Others have developed guidelines, and in some cases the legislature has initiated programs, but provide no state money to local district and offer technical assistance for planning and delivery. The basis finding of the recent Education Commission of the States survey and study, State Strategies to Support Local School Improvement, is that "states can play several substantive and important roles in helping local schools...to improve over time" (Anderson and Odden, 1986). One of the key roles, according to the study, is helping teachers and administrators improve by providing staff development programs. (Crowell, 1986, 1-4)

Since the Kansas State Inservice Plan is partially based on the Florida model, Crowell's comments on the Florida plan and on the Kansas plan are reprinted as follows.

FLORIDA

The legislature of the State of Florida has passed comprehensive legislation which involves teacher certification and staff development. State Board rules have been adopted which interpret this legislation and which govern the activities of the local and county education agencies. In many respects, Florida has been the leader among states in taking action in providing staff development and inservice education for their teaching corps.

State legislation requires that every school district submit a master inservice plan to the Florida Department of Education. The inservice plan must address the needs of teachers in order for them to earn credit points for the extension of their certificate. If the activities offered through the inservice plan at each local district provides 10 hours or more in any particular area, and provides evaluation for competency, the teacher may use if for extension of his/her certificate.

In 1973, the legislature mandated that all school districts (or consortia of districts) in the state form a Teacher Education Center. (School districts are county-wide entities.) There currently are 47 Teacher Education Centers in the State: 42 are single districts and five are consortia. The Teacher Education Center in Florida is a concept; it is not necessarily a gathering place for teachers, although some have developed such a function. The enabling legislation requires that Teacher Education Center is governed by a policy board of at least 11 members, a majority of which must be teachers. Each policy board develops and contacts its own program although a master plan must be approved by the state education agency.

In Florida the total inservice program mandated by the state is funded on a per-student basis. A base State allocation is six dollars per student per year, or approximately $10 million per year for Staff Development. Four dollars of each six dollars are allocated to the local district must go to the Teacher Education Center council to provide Staff Development work planned by them. Two dollars of this six dollars can be used by the local district to address the needs of other personnel in the schools.

In addition to this base allocation, the State provides $2,470,000 per year to the universities for the purpose of bringing university people into the school district to provide training to local educators. This allocation goes directly to the university and may be used to supplement the faculty members' regular load. Although the funds do not go to the school district, the universities generally collaborate with the teacher centers in providing staff members to carry out the Teacher Education Center's plan.

A second aspect of the Florida program is the summer teacher institutes which were created in 1974 to address identified critical teacher shortages throughout the state. The critical shortages and the program areas to be addressed are identified yearly through legislative action. According to the state legislative guidelines, training must be "rigorous and intensive in the contact area". $9,486,000 was allocated in 1986 for the Summer Institute Program. This money is allocated to provide money to pay the staff for each two-week program, as well as for stipends for each teacher who attends.

A third aspect of Staff Development in Florida, which is not reported in this document, is the Beginning Teacher Program. The Beginning Teacher Program was implemented three years ago in Florida to provide training and support for teachers who are at the induction level in Florida. This new certification proposal also calls for Staff Development for retraining teachers in middle school education.

Evaluation - The State legislature requires that each person evaluate all state supported staff development activities in which they participate and requires that each school district evaluate their programs and the district Teacher Education Center. This evaluation follows a state approved format and is reported in a relatively simple form. In addition to the individual and district level evaluation, all districts must have a plan for data collection on an ongoing basis. (Crowell, 1986, 29-31)

KANSAS

Kansas provides money to the Local Education Agencies on a reimbursement basis for programs which meet certification needs. In 1983 the State Board of Education adopted a Kansas Inservice Education Plan through which local school districts may voluntarily participate. Under the Kansas state plan, each participating school district prepares a five-year plan using guidelines developed by the state. The districts establish a professional development council and develop criteria to evaluate inservice that they provide. The state department's role in this plan is to approve the plans and act to facilitate the programs proposed by the local districts. Under a new act passed in 1984 and funded in 1985, districts can be reimbursed for half of their actual costs for approved programs up to 1/4 of one percent of their general fund operating budget. (Crowell, 1986, 34)

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT RESOURCES

Leadership

Bennis, Warren & Nanus, Burt (1985). Leaders - The Strategies for Taking Charge. New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.

Garfield, Charles (1986). Peak Performers. New York, NY: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Peters, Tom & Austin, Nancy (1985). A Passion for Excellence The Leadership Difference. New York, NY: Warner Books.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1984). Leadership and Excellence in Schooling. Educational Leadership, 41(5), 14-23.

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. (1987) Dimensions of Effective Leadership. Austin, TX: SEDL Office of Institutional Communications.

Staff Development

Council on the Continuing Education Unit, (1984). Principles of Good Practice in Continuing Education. Silver Spring, MD: Council on the CEU.

Craig, Robert L. (Ed.), (1976). Training and Development Handbook - A Guide to Human Resource Development. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Fielding, Glen D. & Schalock, H. Del, (1985). Promoting the Professional Developmenty of Teachers and Administrators. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Gardner, Howard (1985). Frames of Mind - The Theory of Multiple Intelligences. New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Glatthorn, Allan A. (1984). Differentiated Supervision. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD Stock Number: 611-84326).

Johnson, David W., Johnson, Roger T., Holubec, Edythe Johnson & Roy, Patricia. (1984) Circles of Learning. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD Stock Number 611-84324).

Joyce, Bruce & Showers, Beverly (1988). Student Achievement Through Staff Development. White Plains, NY: Longman Inc.

Joyce, Bruce & Showers, Beverly (1983). Power in Staff Development Through Research on Training. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, (ASCD Stock Number: 611-83304)

Kiersey, David & Bates, Marilyn (1984). Please Understand Me Character & Temperament Types. Del Mar, CA: Peometheus Nemesis Book Company.

Knox, Allan B. (1980). Developing, Administering, and Evaluating Adult Education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Limited.

Kolb, Patricia J. & Cazad, Larry (1982). Staff Development: A Process Approach. Oshkosh, WI: University of Wisconsin.

Loucks-Horsley, Susan; Harding, Catherine K.: Arbuckle, Margaret A.; Murray, Lynn B.; Dubea, Cynthia; & Williams Martha K. (1987). Continuing to Learn a Guidebook for Teacher Development. Andover, MA: The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands.

Mager, Robert F. (1962). Preparing Instructional Objectives. Palo Alto, CA: Fearon Publishers, Inc.

NSDC (1980). The Journal of Staff Development. (1)1. Oxford, OH: The National Staff Development Council.

Robinson, Russel D. (1979). Helping Adults Learn and Change. Milwaukee, WI: Omnibook Co.

Van Hoose, William H. & Worth, Maureen R. (1982). Adulthood in the Life Cycle. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers.

Wade, Ruth K. (1985). What makes a Difference in Inservice Teacher Education? A Meta-Analysis of Research. Educational Leadership, 42(4) 48, 48-59.

Zumwalt, Karen K. (Ed.), (1986). Improving Teaching. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, (ASCD Stock Number: 610-86001)

School Improvement

Joyce, Bruce; Hersh, Richard H. & McKibbin, Michael (1983). The Structure of School Improvement. White Plains, NY: Longman Inc.

Leiberman, Ann & Miller, Lynne (1984). Teachers, Their World, and Their Work - Implications for School Improvement. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD Stock Number 611-84334).

Loucks-Horsley, Susan & Hergert, Leslie F. (1985). An Action Guide to School Improvement. Andover, MA: The Network.

NAESP (1984). Standards for Quality Elementary Schools. Restin, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

NSDC (1983). Staff Development and School Improvement. The Journal of Staff Development. (4)1. Oxford, OH: The National Staff Development Council.

Peters, T.J., & Waterman, R.H., Jr. (1982). In Search of Excellence. New York, NY: Warner Books.

U.S. Department of Education (1987). What Works. Pueblo, CO. 81009.

KASCD Record
Emporia State University
1200 Commercial
Emporia, Kansas 66801

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Emporia, Kansas
66801
Permit No. 203